APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/613,059	07/02/2003	James M. Sangroniz	100110746-1	6668

22879   7590   02/06/2008
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
SHECHTMAN, CHERYL MARIA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2163	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/06/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
mkraft@hp.com
ipa.mail@hp.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action ***Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief***	10/613,059	SANGRONIZ, JAMES M.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cheryl M. Shechtman	2163	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED <u>22 January 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

    a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

    b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

      Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

<u>NOTICE OF APPEAL</u>

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

<u>AMENDMENTS</u>

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because

    (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

    (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

    (c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

    (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

      NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

    The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

    Claim(s) allowed: _____.

    Claim(s) objected to: _____.

    Claim(s) rejected: *1-9, 15-26 and 30-33*.

    Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

<u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u>

11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

_____.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. ☒ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>.

WILSON LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 13. Other:

Applicant's arguments filed with respect to claims have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Referring to claim 20, in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the transformed user request comprises additional information beyond that which is already present in the original user request) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

The rejections of claims 30 and 31 are also maintained for the same reasons as that of claim 20 above.

Referring to claim 1, Applicant argues that Squires fails to teach that the communications interface communicates with one or more workflow processing devices located external of the workflow management device, specifically that the input module 24 of server 20 (Fig. 3) does not communicate with printing/finishing devices 5, 7(Fig. 1) and 77-79 (Fig. 8). However, Examiner respectfully disagrees and asserts that the purpose of the printing workflow system which the server 20 and input module 24 resides is to coordinate, process and distribute printing jobs among a plurality of cells, where each cell is comprised of at least one device for completing the document processing jobs (see Abstract). Therefore, since the input module communicates with cells 4, 6 (Fig. 1) and cell 72 (Fig. 8), Examiner submits that input module also communicates with printing/finishing devices 5,7 (Fig. 1) and 77-79 (Fig. 8) since cells 4,6 and 72 comprise devices 5,7 and 77-79. As such, Examiner maintains that Squires does teach that the communications interface communicates with one or more workflow processing devices located external of the workflow management device.

The rejection of claim 15 is also maintained for the same reasons as that of claim 1 above.
Referring to claims 4-9, 17-19, 22-26, 32, and 33, in response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See In re McLaughlin, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Referring to claim 9, Applicant argues that the combination of Squires/Yalcinalp fails to teach at least one stylesheet comprising instructions written in an XSL format. However, Examiner respectfully disagrees. The combination of Squires/Yalcinalp discloses at least one stylesheet with predefined rules in a storage device comprising instructions written in an XSL format (Squires, col. 4, line 11- col. 5, line 15; Fig. 5-7; Yalcinalp, col. 6, lines 55-57; col. 1, lines 20-25). As such, Examiner maintains that combination of Squires/Yalcinalp does teach at least one stylesheet comprising instructions written in an XSL format.

Referring to claim 32, Applicant argues that the combination of Squires/Yalcinalp fails to teach that each style sheet corresponds to a different subset of the product properties. However, Examiner respectfully disagrees. The combination of Squires/Yalcinalp teaches at least one stylesheet with predefined rules corresponds to a different subset of product properties (Squires, see Fig. 7; Fig. 4, element 48). As such, Examiner maintains that combination of Squires/Yalcinalp does teach that each style sheet corresponds to a different subset of the product properties.

Referring to claim 33, Applicant is unclear as to which elements of Fig. 4 of Squires in the combination of Squires/Yalcinalp teaches that the transformed user request generated by a first one of the stylesheets has a different workflow that the transformed user request generated by a second one of the stylesheets. Examiner submits that in Fig. 4, the subjob 48 transformed request generated by stylesheet for cell 32 (element 48) has a separate workflow (Fig, 4, elements 48, 32, 34, and 36-38) than the workflow for subjob 50 transformed request generated by stylesheet for cell 40, (element 48), the workflow comprising Fig. 4, elements (50, 40, 42, and 44-46). As such, Examiner maintains that the combination of Squires/Yalcinalp does teach that the transformed user request generated by a first one of the stylesheets has a different workflow that the transformed user request generated by a second one of the stylesheets.

Any claims not addressed are also rejected for the same reasons as the aforenoted claims.